Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	RECEIVED
2000 Biennial Regulatory Review)	CC Docket No. 00-22 558 1 6 2001
Telecommunications Service Quality Reporting Requirements)	FROERAL COMMANMATIONS GOMMANMANNA OFFICE OF THE RESIDENCE

REPLY COMMENTS OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

SBC Communications Inc. (SBC) files these brief reply comments to reiterate its support for the Commission's efforts to streamline its existing service quality monitoring program.

Several parties in this proceeding argue that existing service quality reporting requirements, although outdated, should be retained. Others argue that streamlining the program is premature, despite a mandate under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act)¹ to do so. SBC urges the Commission to ignore those parties who clearly want to use regulation for the sole reason of burdening their competitors. In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), the Commission has wisely initiated reform that is needed and is consistent with the deregulatory nature of the Act. SBC supports the Commission in seeing that reform through to fruition.

The Commission desires to put into place a monitoring program that is simple. SBC embraces that suggestion wholeheartedly. In fact, simplicity is one essential characteristic of any monitoring plan that has utility for purchasers of telecommunications services. To maximize utility, elements of a monitoring plan must be of interest to consumers, that is, be elements that actually affect their buying decisions.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+4
List A B C D E

Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56, codified at 47 U.S.C. § 151 et seq. Indeed, Section 11(b) of the Act instructs the Commission during its biennial review of regulations to "repeal or modify any regulation it determines to be no longer necessary..."

and be easily understood. Of course, utility to consumers also requires that there be data available by which consumers can compare the results of one provider to others, in much the same way as consumers compare airlines' "on time arrival" performance. Excessive reporting categories, on the other hand, are simply superfluous. They do not provide consumers with added information of value but do impose a costly burden on carriers. Accordingly, all but the most basic reporting categories should be eliminated.

Foremost in this effort toward simplification is the need to eliminate the reporting of highly technical information. Among those excessive reporting requirements that should be discarded are ARMIS Reports 43-05 and 43-06. The many categories contained in those reports (over 30), much of them highly technical, are essentially useless to consumers. Their inclusion in the Commission's monitoring program again imposes a burden with no benefit. As such, they should no longer be required.

Absent refinement and definition, the NARUC White Paper is not a good substitute for the Commission's current reporting program.² For example, it assumes that carriers already gather the required data for internal business purposes or for reporting to the states. In reality, most carriers and states aggregate the information differently. As a result, reporting under the NARUC White Paper may require significant programming efforts and costs for many carriers. In addition, there is a need for definition and clarity of many of the operative terms employed by the NARUC White Paper in order to assure uniformity and efficiency in reporting. SBC is willing to engage with the Commission and the rest of the industry in an effort to use the NARUC White Paper as a template

² Pursuant to the SBC/Ameritech Merger Conditions SBC files quarterly service quality reports based on the NARUC White Paper. *See* Applications of Ameritech Corp. and SBC Communications Inc. for Consent to Transfer Control of Corporations Holding Commission Licenses and Lines Pursuant to Section 214 and 310(d) of the Communications Act and Parts 5, 22, 24, 25, 63, 90, 95, and 101 of the Commission's Rules, CC Docket No. 98-141, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 14712 (1999).

from which to model a monitoring program that meets the goals stated in the NPRM and is of substantial utility to consumers.

The Commission is in a unique position to implement a monitoring program in a manner that is drastically simpler yet more effective than that which currently exists. The NPRM indicates that it is prepared to do so.³ Reform implemented by the Commission in this proceeding could eliminate the truly anachronistic reporting scheme in place today and replace it with a boldly simple mechanism applied to all carriers—one that simultaneously provides consumers with succinct and valuable information necessary to choose telecommunications providers. SBC stands behind the Commission in this effort.

Respectfully Submitted,

SBC COMMUNICATIONS INC.

By:

Paul E. Dorin Roger K. Toppins Paul K. Mancini

SBC Communications Inc. 1401 I St N.W., Room 1100 Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 326-8898 Facsimile: (202) 408-8763

Its Attorneys

February 16, 2001

³ The Commission might consider involving in a more direct fashion the thoughts of residence and business consumers with respect to elements of service that are apt to affect their buying decisions. Such an effort might include open forums and/or focus groups designed to identify those few key elements that are of most importance and utility.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Regina Ragucci, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of SBC Communications was on this 16th day of February 2001, was served by first class, U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to the following parties:

Regina Ragucci

DAVID W. ZESIGER INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS ALLIANCE 1300 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW, SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 KAREN BRINKMAN
RICHARD R. CAMERON
BENOIT JACQMOTTE
LATHAM & WATKINS
COUNSEL FOR INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE &
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ALLIANCE
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW, SUITE 1300
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

LAWRENCE E. HARRIS TERRI B. NATOLI EDWARD B. KRACHMER TELIGENT, INC 8065 LEESBURG PIKE, SUITE 400 VIENNA, VA 22182

DAVID SVANDA ROBERT NELSON MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 6545 MERCANTILE WAY LANSING, MI 48911

LAWRENCE E. SARJEANT
LINDA L. KENT
KEITH TOWNSEND
JOHN W. HUNTE
JULIE E. RONES
UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION
1401 H STREET, NW, SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

JAMES L. CASSERLY MINTZ, LEVIN, COHEN, GLOVSKY AND POPEO COUNSEL FOR AT&T CORP. 701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20016

DONNA N. LAMPERT MARK J. O'CONNOR LAMPERT & O'CONNOR, PC COUNSEL FOR EARTHLINK, INC. 1750 K STREET, NW, SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20006

ALAN BUZACOTT WORLDCOM 1801 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006

GEORGE N. BARCLAY MICHAEL J. ETTNER GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION 1800 F STREET, NW, ROOM 4002 WASHINGTON, DC 20405 SHARON J. DEVINE KATHRYN MARIE KRAUSE JAMES T. HANNON QWEST CORPORATION 1020 19TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036

SUSAN J. BAHR LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN J. BAHR, PC COUNSEL FOR BLUESTEM TELEPHONE CO. PO BOX 86089 MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, MD 20886-6089 SUSAN J. BAHR LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN J. BAHR, PC COUNSEL FOR RURAL LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIERS PO BOX 86089 MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, MD 20886-6089

GENEVIEVE MORELLI DAVID C. KIRSCHNER KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP COUNSEL FOR THE JOINT COMMENTERS 1200 19TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20036

SUSAN J. BAHR LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN J. BAHR, PC COUNSEL FOR FRANKLIN TELEPHONE CO. PO BOX 86089 MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, MD 20886-6089

JAY C. KEITHLEY SPRINT CORPORATION 401 9TH STREET, NW, SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20004 JASON OXMAN COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY 600 14TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005

KIMBERLY M. KIRBY JONATHAN ASKIN ASSOCIATION FOR LOCAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES 888 17TH STREET, NW, SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20006

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION INDIANA GOVERNMENT CENTER SOUTH 302 WEST WASHINGTON STREET SUITE E306 INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

RICHARD M. SBARATTA STEPHEN L. EARNEST BELLSOUTH CORPORATION 675 WEST PEACHTREE STREET, NE, SUITE 4300 ATLANTA, GA 30309 RICHARD METZGER PAMELA ARLUK FOCAL COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION 7799 LEESBURG PIKE SUITE 850 N FALLS CHURCH, VA 22043

CYNTHIA B. MILLER FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-0872 R. RUSSELL MILLER SIEMENS MEDICAL SOLUTIONS HEALTH SERVICES CORPORATION 51 VALLEY STREAM PARKWAY MALVERN, PA 19355

JOSEPH DIBELLA VERIZON 1320 NORTH COURT HOUSE ROAD, 8TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201 MYRA KAREGIANES SARAH A. NAUMER THOMAS G. ARIDA ILLINOIS COMMERCE CORPORATION 160 N. LaSALLE, SUITE C-800 CHICAGO, IL 60601

JODI JENKINS BAIR PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO 180 EAST BROAD STREET COLUMBUS, OH 43215-3793 R. SCOTT REITER
L. MARIE GUILLORY
DANIEL MITCHELL
NATIONAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
ASSOCIATION
4121 WILSON BOULEVARD, 10TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

PAT WOOD JUDY WALSH BRETT A. PERLMAN PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS 1701 N. CONGRESS AVENUE PO BOX 13326 AUSTIN, TX 78711-3326

JAMES BRADFORD RAMSAY SHARLA BARKLIND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS 1101 VERMONT AVENUE, NW, SUITE 200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005

LYNDA L. DORR PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN 610 NORTH WHITNEY WAY PO BOX 7854 MADISON, WI 53707-5481 STEVE ELLENBECKER
STEVE FURTNEY
KRISTIN H. LEE
WYOMING PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
HANSEN BUILDING
2515 WARREN AVENUE, SUITE 300
CHEYENNE, WY 82002

KATHLEEN M. MARSHALL ADVANCED TELCOM GROUP, INC. 5175 PARKSTONE DRIVE, SUITE 150 CHANTILLY, VA 21051 ROBERT S. TONGREN DAVID C. BERMANN OHIO CONUMERS' COUNSEL 10 WEST BROAD STREET, SUITE 1800 COLUMBUS, OH 43215-3485

GEORGE N. BARCLAY MICHAEL J. ETTNER GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION 1800 F STREET, NW ROOM 4002 WASHINGTON, DC 20405

SUSAN J. BAHR LAW OFFICES OF SUSAN J. BAHR, PC COUNSEL FOR VERMONT ITCs PO BOX 86089 MONTGOMERY VILLAGE, MD 20886-6089

LAURIE PAPPAS TEXAS OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL 1701 N. CONGRESS AVENUE, SUITE 9-180 AUSTIN, TX 78701